

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

In Defense of Anti-Semitism

by Edgar J. Steele

February 15, 2003

An *anti-Semite* used to mean a man who hated Jews.

Now it means a man who is hated *by* Jews.

- Joseph Sobran (Sobran's, Sep. 2002.)

I wanted to call this, "Why I am an anti-semite." It is telling, indeed, that even I finally knuckled under and chose a less sensational title.

The silence in America concerning jews is simply deafening, isn't it? The old adage has it that, when visiting a foreign country, to ascertain who really runs things, one need determine only who is spoken about in whispers, if at all.

Never unwilling to offend, I would like to talk about jews today. And not in whispers, either. This piece will be longer than most I write, even though I will only be skimming the field. A good deal of ground must be covered, else the true picture does not emerge.

What gets lost in all the sabre rattling and bellicosity concerning Iraq is the WHY of the impending war. Because the Iraqis "hate our freedom?" No, obviously not. Because they are too evil to exist? Come on. Because they have used awful weapons, still possess them and will use them again? Give me a break - on the basis of that rationale, we should be marching on every member of NATO.

The Muslims are right, you know. This is a war against Islam, pure and simple. Not Christianity vs. Islam. Not the West vs. Islam. Not America vs. Islam. This is a war between Judaism and Islam. Palestine writ large. Not a religious war, either, despite the rhetoric of the Arabs. It is a racial war and Americans are the cannon fodder.

"But Israel is our friend," you say, "The best friend we have in that hostile quarter of the world." Our *only* friend, more like it. Israel is our friend so long as we serve its purposes. Indeed, "friend" is too kind a word. "Svengali" is more like it. Proof abounds of Israel acting against America's interests at every turn, many of which we will review below. No, Israel does not run America, but the shadowy cartel that does run America is solidly behind Israel. Israel is that cartel's mistress, America its dowdy wife. No, not every member of that cartel is jewish, but so many are that it might as well be exclusive.

There was a time, in the not-too-distant past, when I thought that jewishness was religious and cultural, possibly racial, too - but so what? After all, American jews are generally well off, well educated, well spoken, a little clannish and well connected. Just like you and me, only better dressed and with trust funds - like rich Mormons, maybe. It is an outlook shared by most Americans. It is wrong. This common misperception will prove fatal to America, just as it has to so many nations down through time.

This is where I am supposed to utter the obligatory, "I'm not anti-semitic, I'm really just anti-zionist." That is a cop-out and I refuse to do it, even though strictly true. I am appalled that all jews allow the zionists among them to fall back into their ranks, hiding behind their jewishness, while hurling charges of anti-semitism at those they dislike - *and their fellow jews don't say a word about it*. In the law, we call that a conspiracy and we lock up the co-conspirators just like the perps. Ok, I'll play. I'm anti-semitic. So what? Do you really blame me, after all that you have done to me, my family and my country - nay, the world?

Let's get the terms straight. Joe Sobran really is right on the money regarding "anti-semite," first of all. Ultimately an antisemite is whatever a jew says - whoever a jew dislikes - and, ultimately, jews seem to dislike everybody else. In fact, I have seen jews acknowledge that everybody who isn't a jew is, by definition, anti-semitic. Kind of like the rationale underlying hate crime laws, which are only applied against white people, because all white people are deemed racist, *per se*.

"Jew." It's a race, not a religion. Facts are facts. The majority of Israelis are atheist. At this moment, jews are doggedly trying to craft a deadly virus that will select people, such as Arabs, for their DNA differences from jewish DNA. And I don't want to hear all this buzz about Khazar versus Sephardic jews or who deserves to claim to be descended from the Biblical family of Abraham. There is a group of people scattered throughout the world that calls itself jewish. We all know who they are, just as they do. They are

racially identifiable, even if of two or three flavors. They get the label "jew," and that is reality, history aside.

"Zionist." Used to mean those who worked toward the establishment of a jewish homeland. Now it means jewish supremacist, pure and simple. Kind of like white supremacist, only kosher. Zionists are the real problem and they are found among the ranks of jews everywhere. They are the ones that always cross the line and get the whole lot of them thrown out of a country. You don't believe this? Ok, then you offer a single logical reason why it has happened, time and again, in all the European countries. Zionism is racism of the first order.

Yes, jews do get persecuted. What gets overlooked is the reason. Kind of like focusing on the rights of the murderer and not his victim. No, not "kind of." That's exactly what it is. "Oy! Foist Egypt, den Germany, now here. Why are dey poisecuting us so?" Trust me, they know precisely why.

Generally, it appears to me that someone has to have had a trigger event of some sort happen to themselves or someone close to them before that person is willing to see jews as predatory. A trigger event wherein a jew played the role of the victimizer. Like how being raped will make any woman a rabid defender of the Second Amendment. Without a trigger event, people generally are willing to dismiss those who speak out as being nuts, racists and white supremacists. Like saying the raped woman was asking for it, that's how that treatment feels, believe me.

My trigger event was actually two. First, when a lawyer that I hired, hoping that he would work hard and eventually take over my thriving San Francisco law practice, allowing me to retire, tried to steal all my firm's clients, work in progress and employees, leaving me with nothing, this after only a couple months on the job. Jewish, of course. Most lawyers are, you know. Though the sledding was tough with this guy, due to the jewish judges, eventually I eviscerated him financially - with the help of a black judge, at that.

Second, and this was the really key event, when my children received death threats from a jewish telephone caller - merely because I had dared to represent Richard Butler and the Aryan Nations against a set of false charges. There have been lots of other events since then, but I will never forget the look in my little girl's tear-filled eyes as she told me about the woman who was going to kill her. Watching one's family butchered will make a terrorist of anyone, just ask the Palestinians. Similarly, watching your family terrorized by zionists will make you anti-semitic, take it from me.

The trigger event serves as a sort of personalized wake up call. Once awake, the evidence of what is being done to America and the world becomes apparent. None so blind as those who will not see, and all that. And that evidence is everywhere.

Supposedly, jews account for 2-1/2 per cent of the American population. Why, then, is half the student body at Harvard and most every Ivy League college jewish? Statistics simply are not kept as to the percentage of jews in this profession or that, but when was the last time you saw a doctor whose name did not end in "berg," "man" or "stein?" I'm not sure I have ever met a psychiatrist who wasn't jewish. On the other hand, have you ever seen a jewish farmer or mechanic?

Rarely do I appear in court, but what the guy on the other side of the courtroom - and often as not, the judge, too - is jewish. And, it is incredible the deference paid by the bench to the jewish DA, or whoever, sitting at the other counsel table. There has been more than one trial where I could have merely phoned in my participation, for all the good it mattered that I was even there.

So many complain about what bankers, especially the international and central bankers, are doing to our country. Yet, hardly anybody seems to have noticed that those people are almost exclusively jewish.

They are everywhere in the media, particularly Hollywood. Talking heads, movie stars and the like. Curly hair, hook nose and names that rhyme. Pay attention and you will be amazed. The names won't always be a good guideline, however, given how many changed their names at the turn of the last century, so as to meld into the American population of that time.

Jews seem to comprise about 50% of America's population, based upon those in visible positions. Looks can be deceiving, though, because, like Harvard, they are drawn to those positions by their money, their intelligence and, most importantly, the indulgence of their kosher comrades.

People refuse to notice the jewish hands on virtually ever power lever in the US federal government. Or at the helm of virtually every media organization that exists, and throughout the executive and editorial ranks. And, it's not just jews that control America - they are zionists. Even Ariel Sharon, Israel's current Prime Minister, has said openly, "Every time we do something you tell me America will do this and will do

that . . . I want to tell you something very clear: Don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We, the Jewish people, control America, and the Americans know it." (October 3, 2001). Problem is, most of us seem not to know it.

Books have been written on the subject, but, essentially, a group of late 19th-century elites, comprised of Rockefeller, Morgan and others, mostly Jewish, established an organization designed to consolidate their control of America and, eventually, the entire world. It was called the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Offshoots, such as the Bilderbergers, have formed since then, but the objective has never slipped from their sight.

One of the first acts of CFR's members was to survey the newspaper field, the sole mass media of the time, and conclude that purchasing control of only 25 major newspapers would give them effective control of news dissemination. They bought those papers and, since then, many, many more. Today, members of these shadowy organizations literally run virtually all of the media, control the political structure in America, much of world business and are firmly in control of world banking.

That is why the two political parties in America have become identical, so as to provide us rubes with the illusion of throwing the rascals out come election time, yet with the same old agenda not missing a beat. Did you really see a difference from Bush to Clinton to Bush? They knew what NAFTA would do to America's manufacturing base and job structure, yet both parties embraced it. We are firmly on a path to one-world government. America writ large, but the America now being molded without individual civil rights, not the America of the 20th Century. And it's largely kosher.

Read "The Israeli Spy Ring Scandal"

<http://people.msoe.edu/~taylorm/mirror/www.whatreallyhappened.com/spyring.html> for a particularly chilling look into the extent of the Israeli spy ring recently uncovered in America and Israel's extensive US telephone network ownership.

It is not the purpose of this essay to prove Jewish control of America. There is ample material available on the internet for those who wish to prove it for themselves. Rather, it is my purpose to show that there are perfectly valid and understandable, even laudable, reasons for being anti-semitic. Resenting those who manipulate us on a daily basis, against our own best interests, is primary among them.

2-1/2% Jews versus 70% Caucasian (used to be 95%, not too long ago), yet they set the agenda domestically and internationally. Why else do you think we are even in the Middle East? The oil is the excuse that allows us cynically to stop and look no deeper. Notice the extreme difference between US policy in the Middle East versus elsewhere, exemplified by the fact that we are invading and destroying Iraq, a country with nothing, while we give a pass to North Korea, a country which just threatened to nuke America.

And it is not enough that Zionists control America. They have to reshape it to suit themselves.

Virtually every recent case that involves the removal of Christian symbols from society is brought and/or prosecuted by a Jew, usually with a Jewish judge presiding. For the sake of the feelings of 2-1/2%, all the rest of us must yield our cultural heritage. Removing "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance. Taking down plaques of the Ten Commandments. Removing crosses from public venues. Erecting menorahs in public venues. Taking Christ out of Christmas, first, then Christmas out of the year-end holidays altogether.

Hate laws are a singularly Jewish invention being foisted upon an unsuspecting public, so as to preemptively remove the possibility of criticism of themselves. Often written by the ADL, the organization that lobbies for their adoption, state by state, the laws are designed to stifle dissent and speaking out. Even now, the ADL seeks to broaden their sweep to include Holocaust revisionism, as has occurred in Canada and most of Europe, where many people sit in jail for publicly stating true facts about the so-called Holocaust that Jews simply do not want publicized.

America's borders are kept wide open to a flood of illegal immigrants, purposely, apparently to dilute the population (why else?), thereby making us more easily controlled. Yet, there is a furious struggle to expel those who criticize Jews, such as is taking place with Ernst Zundel at this very moment. Contrast this policy imposed upon America with the extremely closed society of Israel, which is reserved solely for Jews.

The money that Israel has cost us, facilitated by their Jewish brethren, is nothing short of breathtaking. For a particularly good discussion of those costs, see "Costs of U.S. Middle East Policy: An Economic

Overview," by Dr. Thomas R. Stauffer http://www.jfjfp.org/backgroundF4_stauffer.htm A couple of particularly salient paragraphs from Dr. Stauffer's work:

"Policy in the Middle East has been very costly to the US, as well as to the rest of world. The cost to the US of its policies in the region has accumulated to over \$ 2,500 billion, an amount greater than the cost of the Vietnam war...About two-thirds of those costs – circa \$1,600 billion – arose from the US defense of Israel since 1973...Since 1973, however, protection of Israel and subsidies to countries such as Egypt and Jordan, willing to sign peace treaties with Israel, has been the prime driver of US outlays or the trigger for crisis costs."

\$2,500 billion, or \$2.5 trillion. Boggles the mind, doesn't it? Lessee now, America has a population of 290 million and about 80 million households, so that amounts to \$31,250 from your family to Israel. And that doesn't include some other items which could easily double that figure, as demonstrated by Dr. Stauffer as he continues:

"Rescue of Israel in 1973 by President Nixon cost the US almost \$900 billion in lost GDP, resulting from the Arab oil embargo, and higher oil import costs...Worsening political relations resulted in the loss of hundreds of thousands of US jobs...Hundreds of billions additionally were spent on "Project Independence", ostensibly to emancipate the US from reliance upon ME oil. The projects were largely co-opted by domestic lobbies of diverse colorations, and little imported oil was actually displaced."

What is ironic, if not pathetic, is that an incredible amount of our own tax dollars, given to Israel, come back in the form of campaign contributions to American politicians, funneled through American jewish hands and foundations, making Israeli/jewish interests the single largest lobby in Washington, DC. Any politician that dares vote or speak against zionist interests faces a withering campaign at election time, ultimately funded by the country's own taxpayers, in the main. Now you see why Sharon's statement about controlling the US is true, quite aside from the considerable direct control exercised by American jews.

And zionists will do anything to advance their own interests. The 1967 extended attempt to sink the USS Liberty in international waters off the coast of Gaza, for example, killing 37 US sailors and injuring another 174. It is unclear whether the Israelis were attempting to eliminate witnesses to atrocities they were committing during the "Six-Days War" or attempting to create their own Reichstag event by blaming Egypt for sinking the Liberty with all hands. False flag operations are particularly favorite Israeli ploys, however, so as to curry support.

And, there are far too many problems with the official 9-11 story. The only real question is whether the US or Israel was really behind it. John Kaminski sums up a number of them eloquently in "Billions are wondering why" <http://disc.server.com/discussion.cgi?id=149495;article=37490> :

"Few people are raising questions about the obviously false statements we have been told about 9/11? Why did it take 28 minutes for flight controllers to notify NORAD two planes had been hijacked when the average time to do so in such a case is 3 minutes? Why were fighters scrambled from a base 180 miles away when seven other bases had fighter jets ready that could have done the job in a fraction of the time? Why was FEMA in New York the night before the crashes? Why did those fires at the base of the towers burn for 100 days? Why did Bush read a book for a half hour when he knew two planes had hit and two more were hijacked? Why was the bin Ladin family flown out of the country when all flights were grounded? Why did the FBI chief say we had no warning this was coming and everybody else in the FBI say we had plenty of warning? Who did make the billions of dollars from all those put options on two airlines the day before the attacks? These are only a fraction of the question the government continues to cover up, as several billions of people know."

Even Mr. Kaminski stays away from the obvious jewish involvement, however. Not a mention of the Israeli "art students" caught celebrating on a rooftop nearby while they photographed the ghastly spectacle. Nor of all the missing Israeli executives and workers that day, people who otherwise would have died. Nor of the two-hour advance warning provided to the employees at Odigo in the building (a jewish telephone firm). Nor of many other indicators of Israeli involvement.

In particular, hardly anybody wants to discuss who benefited from 9-11. The Afghanis? Yeah, right. Al Qaeda? Not a chance. Iraq? Sure. What country was plummeting in world, especially American, opinion at the time, whose fortunes in that regard turned around 180 degrees overnight? Israel, of course.

And we haven't even discussed what Israel has done to the hapless Palestinians, or what they are about to do, just as soon as we are distracted by Baghdad II.

As if the provisions of Patriot Acts I and II, whereby Americans can be jailed without hearings, stripped of their citizenship and deported for "further processing," recently, Israeli hit squads were given the go ahead to roam the entire world, including America, all the better to protect Israel's interests.

Yes, there are an abundance of reasons to be offended by Israelis, Zionists and, even, the Jews who provide cover for their brethren. Most people deny the existence of most of those reasons, and ignore the rest, until they suffer their own "trigger event."

Every time I talk about Zionists, or Jews, or Israel, I come under an incredible assault on my web site and my email servers, some from Lebanon, where Israel maintains internet servers, and even more from American Jews. False claims to my ISPs, in an attempt to get me shut up. Viruses...you wouldn't believe how many. And hate speech! You haven't seen hate speech until you have seen what righteously indignant Jews can deliver. If you could just see what will be happening on my computer in the coming week, that alone likely would make you a believer.

But, it is important that these things be said. Out loud, not in whispers. People have to wake up. It is almost too late. You see, they are on the verge of adapting the Hate Crime laws to outlaw such discussions altogether.

New America. An idea whose time has come.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/antisemite.htm>

In Defense of Racism

Part 1 - Overview

by Edgar J. Steele

June 30, 2003

Part 1 - Overview (released June 30, 2003)

Part 2 - Intellectual Myths (to be released)

Part 3 - Genetic Realities (to be released)

Part 4 - Cultural Imperatives (to be released)

Part 5 - National Disasters (to be released)

Part 6 - The Future (to be released)

"Racism works. Racism is good."

(with apologies to Gordon Gecko, as played by Michael Douglas in "Wall Street")

Of course, whether racism "works" depends upon one's definition. One man's racism is another's multiculturalism, another's hell and yet another's nirvana. I'm not even going to bother with dictionary definitions. Let's deal in today's realities, instead.

"Racist" is a term applied not only to one who prefers one race to another, but also to those who think their race is superior and more deserving. Racist is an epithet in almost all contexts. Even those who might properly be called racist prefer to think of themselves as "racialists," as though the slight word change makes a difference to anybody but themselves. Racist connotes bigotry, the unthinking rejection of another based upon his or her skin color. Racist implies stereotyping, whereby certain negative characteristics found in certain members of a race are attributed to all members of that race. Are we on the same page here?

In truth, "racist" is just as quickly applied to many who seek simple equality with others, most notably outspoken white people in America these days. In fact, there are those who argue, with a straight face, that only white people are capable of being racist. Thus, the term has lost much of its currency, together with its legitimacy.

Racist has become like "antisemite," applied with a broad brush to swaths of humanity, usually those simply disliked by Jews for any reason, who have co-opted the term "semitic" for themselves, just as they previously co-opted the word "Jew."

Interestingly, often the very same people quick to accuse one of antisemitism are the very ones who label others racist, too.

Accusation, conviction and sentence, all in a single word: racist. There is no defense. Those who bluster about how they are not racists merely become more tightly embraced by that particular tar baby.

However, just as I previously have written credibly in support of antisemitism ([In Defense of Anti-Semitism](#)), so, too, is racism susceptible of being defended.

Beauty is only skin deep, but ugly goes to the bone, some cynically jest. Many argue that the only difference between the races is skin color. If true, our discussion would end right here, because then racism of any sort truly would be reprehensible conduct. However, they are wrong. Race goes beyond the bone, in fact, and is lodged deeply in our DNA.

A popular current myth is that there is no intellectual difference between races, despite contrary results derived in virtually every study of intellect ever done by anybody. This myth also flies in the face of the personal experience of nearly every human being alive.

If one can inherit a superior muscle structure, as can readily be confirmed by the barest of glances at the racial makeup of pro sports rosters, then why is it such a stretch for so many to believe that superior intellect is genetically encoded, as well? Because those same myth purveyors believe that superior intellect makes for superiority, period, that's why. The good news is that they are wrong about the superiority thing. The bad news is that they are wrong about the lack of racial intellectual differences. The worse news is that they are in charge.

Because raw intellect is measured so easily, there really can be no rational contesting the obvious differences in racial IQs. That has become, for me, a singularly uninteresting question. For those who might take issue with me on this topic and come away disappointed by my disinterest, there are many books and research study reports. Perhaps the best is "The Bell Curve." Read it. Do your own research. Think it out for yourself. Until you can overcome your programming by this simple precursor, the rest of my discussion will be a waste of time for you.

The more interesting questions concern differences brought about by racial culture, on the one hand, and one's genetic structure, on the other. IQ merely is one result of genetic determination, after all, as is skin color. Character, for lack of a better term, is a far more important result, one that only recently is being recognized for having a genetic component at all. We come to life with a full set of matching luggage, already partially filled on the day we are born; indeed, on the day we are conceived. As we grow up, our culture, composed of those around us, especially those with whom we identify, allows us to complete the packing of our matching luggage, which we then drag with us through every moment of our lives.

Culture and genetic predisposition or proclivity are mere kissing cousins, in my opinion. I like to think of genetics as being culture and prior behavior gone to seed. By the way, this outlook works whether one believes in evolution or creation as the source of man.

In animals, we call this culture-gone-to-seed "instinct," of course. We humans often confuse it with reincarnation or various forms of extrasensory perception. It is a far more important cause of racial differences than intellect and has led to some, if not most, of the national disasters throughout history.

By now, you should be agreeing with how irrelevant skin color differences are, incidentally, yet another uninteresting question. We have much bigger fish to fry in this particular series.

I know - some reading this wonder if I am a racist. Well, it depends, of course. *The more interesting question is whether you are a racist.* Stick around and find out. By the end of this series, the answer to both questions should be more than apparent.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/racism1.htm>

In Defense of Racism

Part 2 - Intellectual Myths

by Edgar J. Steele

July 12, 2003

Part 1 - Overview (released June 30, 2003)

Part 2 - Intellectual Myths (released July 12, 2003)

Part 3 - Genetic Realities (to be released)

Part 4 - Cultural Imperatives (to be released)

Part 5 - National Disasters (to be released)

Part 6 - The Future (to be released)

"A dollar for your thoughts...."

--- Marilyn Monroe

I have a theory about IQ: One cannot directly perceive intelligence in another beyond the limit of one's own.

It's kind of like the human eye, which sees well, up to point. Beyond that point, however, radiation every bit as viable as visible light is invisible. Infrared, ultraviolet, x-rays, gamma rays and so on.

And there are emanations below the visible light spectrum, as well, physically identical in every way with visible light, saving only wavelength, except that they cannot be seen with the human eye: radio, TV, microwave, for example.

These radiations all comprise the electromagnetic spectrum. Think of intelligence as being limited in the same way that the eye is limited.

Why else do we fail to see the obvious intelligence possessed by every living creature? So that we can feel justified in enslaving and eating them is the easy answer, but I think the truth is more fundamental.

There are hints of unseen electromagnetic radiation, to be sure, like the warmth generated by unseen infrared radiation. But the eye hasn't a clue.

Neither do so many people walking around out there, despite manifest hints. Every time some dolt tries to best me with his haphazard logic and regurgitated borrowed ideology, bereft of personal examination and integration, this point is driven home with a vengeance. Such arguments are like doing battle with an unarmed opponent, kind of like America versus Iraq. Generally, I have the good sense merely to walk away without proving what is so dreadfully apparent to my own eye, yet equally obviously lost on the other - *because they simply are incapable of perceiving the disparity.*

Seems like they would feel something akin to the reflected heat of infrared light, somehow, and catch a clue from it.

Generally, I can size up another's IQ within a minute or so of conversation, provided it is less than my own. My own IQ has been measured, variously, at between 135 and 155. I have known a number of people in my life that I regarded as intellectual equals. Some of them likely were my superior, but I had no way of discerning their intellectual ability beyond the limit of my own. Some of them hadn't even gone to college, to acknowledge the dedicated Mensans reading this.

Come on, admit it. When another is below your own intelligence level, you know it for a fact, though you might ignore that fact - and should, in your dealings with that person, if you know what is good for you. You knew who were the scholars and the dummies in school and you had them ranked. I'd wager that ranking was identical to the actual distribution of their IQs. Witness the fact that some of the grasshopper-like dummies ranked higher in your eyes than some of the ant-like scholars.

It has become politically incorrect to speak of IQ tests. The reason specifically is because there are racial differences, else there would be no need to obfuscate. For the life of me, I cannot understand why.

Perhaps it is a manifestation of thinking by intelligence in excess of my own, but I doubt it. I suppose it is because so many consider intellectual superiority to denote superiority in all respects. Kind of like thinking women with large breasts are better overall - or blondes, I suppose. Or better-looking people.

Whatever the match up, however, I have noticed that intellect seems to trump all else, as illustrated perfectly by Marilyn Monroe's attraction and marriage to playwright Arthur Miller, a man in almost every respect her opposite. Her divorce from Miller then underscored the fact that character is what endures, what really matters.

I've lived with the obvious difference between my own intellect and virtually everybody around me all my life and honestly do not consider that to make me one whit superior to anybody. It is merely an attribute which I have learned to use in making my way through life, much as any professional has learned to marshal his or her particular talents.

Occasionally I have resorted to beating up another intellectually, often with a relish of which I was not entirely proud, usually when I saw that person intellectually brutalizing another about whom I felt protective. Didn't make me better, any more than some schoolyard bully pushing around another, smaller, kid thereby is made superior.

Think in terms of the bar scene early on in the movie "Good Will Hunting," in which one intellectual bully pushes around another in defending a friend. Though that movie was a caricature, in that it overplayed the intellect of the leading character, the basic thrust was right on the money. I commend it to those who labor under the delusion that members of the intellectual elite of the world consider themselves elite in anything save a single, narrow aspect of existence, an aspect that they, themselves, deem far less important than do others.

It is the intellectual pretenders, gallumphing about in the shoes of true giants, who trumpet their professed superiority, in a vain attempt to impress the rest of us. You know who you are. The bad news is that we know who you are, too - we've just been too polite to mention it. The full range of pretension, unlike intellect, is apparent to all. Arrogance is least attractive in the company of ignorance. Incidentally, this essay has been much more difficult for me to write for fear of appearing to be among this very group, a manifestation of my own version of the basic human condition, noted below.

Truly beautiful people are far less taken with their own appearance than others. When apparent, their vanity and desperation always arises from a fear that they have nothing but their appearance to commend themselves, and that, for only a limited time. Picture the aging debutante, knowing she will never be the doyenne of her circle.

Others have been more attractive than I, yet I denied them superiority over myself - something of which most of America seems incapable in these days of celebrity by media appearance. Others have been taller - that didn't make them better. Despite what commonly is called "short man's complex," tall men are not better than short men. Running faster doesn't do it, either. Nor does the accumulation of wealth. Or, even, power.

Why, just look at our current President, an individual who all but demands that we feel superior as a direct consequence of all that he says and does. In fact, perhaps that is why we elected him, after what we experienced with the genuinely towering intellect of Bill Clinton. Oh, that's right - for a moment there, I forgot that we *didn't* elect Bush.

Why is there such a blindness regarding intelligence? Because, otherwise, there would be no need to cover up the obvious racial differences in IQ. The politically-incorrect truth, in other words.

And those promoting the PC myth of intellectual equality among the races are of two types: First, those who feel inadequate intellectually, therefore consider intellect to be far more important than it really deserves to be and ultimately deny it in hopes that nobody will notice their own inadequacy; and, Second, because many of those who possess true intellectual superiority are ashamed to be seen in possession of riches they believe they do not deserve, yet another compensation for feelings of inadequacy. Bottom line: virtually everybody conspires with virtually everybody else to pretend there are no intellectual differences. This illustrates the basic human condition, by the way: feeling inferior to others, a topic for another day.

Even when we acknowledge intellectual differentials between individuals, still we blindly insist that there are no racial differences similar to the obvious physical racial differences which make pro sports such a black endeavor these days.

Saying the earth was flat did not make it so. The establishment once thought the Sun revolved around the Earth, but that did not make it so. Neither does denying racial differences in IQ.

There have been extensive studies of intelligence, privately and within both academia and the military. The discipline of those studies has been refined through the years. Intelligence in individuals can be measured precisely and with ease. And, contrary to establishment pronouncements, without the results being degraded due to cultural differences. Some of the most dramatic proofs have been generated by liberals in pursuit of opposite conclusions. Indeed, it is that very search which has so refined the study of intelligence.

Generally, I disdain citations, since my writings are not research reports and I consider references and footnotes to clutter writing, obscuring fundamental truths. However, read "The Bell Curve," by Herrnstein and Murray, and become enlightened concerning intelligence. You will find this book remaindered all over the country, because it is held in disdain by the establishment. Like the flat-earth misconception of years gone by, though, that does not make the establishment correct.

Nor will I endeavor to give a comprehensive examination of racial differences; least of all in the area of IQ. Others have done as good a job in that area as I believe possible, certainly better than I could hope to attain. David Duke's landmark work, "My Awakening," has a particularly readable overview of racial differences, for example, one that those who dismiss Duke as a hidebound racist likely will find astonishing. My contribution is my particular take on things.

There is an average 15-point IQ difference between American whites and American blacks. Take it to the bank. All the studies confirm this. My own life experience bears witness to this fact *and so does yours, if you are honest*, regardless of your skin color. More about this later.

That does not make whites superior to blacks.

Let me say it again: Whites are not superior to blacks because the average white IQ is 15 points higher.

Just as blacks are not superior because the average black can run faster and jump higher than the average white.

Nor are jews superior because their average IQ is about 15 points higher than the average white.

Nor are asians superior because their average IQ is about 10 points higher than the average white.

Just as I am not superior to any of the members of those races because my personal IQ is higher than the vast majority of theirs.

Consider: it takes a towering intellect to create a towering house of cards. Look at the economic house of cards that America has erected while in the grip of the One Worlders. Its collapse will put to shame the economic chaos wrought by real dummies all through history. Disasters like that about to happen make a compelling argument that superior intellect might actually be a liability, but that is an essay for another time and place.

It is a myth that superior intellect makes one person better than another. Dispelling this myth is key to dispelling the next.

It is a myth that there are no intellectual differences between the races.

Recognizing the existence of these myths is key to understanding and dealing with the true differences between races which affect us all.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/racism2.htm>

In Defense of Racism

Part 3 - Genetic Realities

by Edgar J. Steele

July 19, 2003

Part 1 - Overview (released June 30, 2003)

Part 2 - Intellectual Myths (released July 12, 2003)

Part 3 - Genetic Realities (released July 19, 2003)

Part 4 - Cultural Imperatives (to be released)

Part 5 - National Disasters (to be released)

Part 6 - The Future (to be released)

Birds do it, bees do it

Even educated fleas do it

---"Let's do it, let's fall in love," Cole Porter

"I will put My law within them and on their heart I will write it..."

--- Jeremiah 31:33

When we brought my youngest daughter home from the hospital for the first time, she fussed and cried all the time. This was in stark contrast to her older brother, who let us sleep through the night after only a couple of days. It went on so long that we had her examined repeatedly for problems. Most theorized that she had colic. They were wrong. She was just being bitchy. She's been sort of like that ever since. It's like the old joke:

The doctor tells his patient: "Lola, I have some good news and some bad news." Lola asks for the good news first.

"Well, the test results are in, and the good news is that you aren't suffering from Pre-menstrual Syndrome, as you'd feared." "And the bad news?" Lola asks. To which the Doc replies: "I'm afraid there's no cure for being a natural bitch."

My youngest daughter's IQ is very high, clearly. Worse, now 13 years old, she shows signs of turning out to be genuinely beautiful. I predict hard times for her in life. Intellect is enough of a curse, in its own way, but physical beauty truly is a cross to be borne. And she has been "high maintenance" since Day 1. I pity the poor guy she marries. Don't get me wrong: Every time I see her, my heart jumps up. I love her so - more than I could ever say.

A side note for those who have yet to have children of their own: the greatest reward of having children, in my opinion, is in learning that you can love another more than you love yourself. Too late? It's never too late. My daughter was born when I was 45.

The point is that my youngest daughter, as well as yours, arrived in life with quite a load of baggage, baggage she inherited on the day she was conceived. She gets both her intellect and her disposition from me; her looks from her mother. My son got only my intellect and was fortunate to receive both his disposition and looks from his mother. They both got their skin colors, hair, height and body builds from us, too. But that's not all. As they have grown, I have been astounded to see flashes of behavior in both of them that I outgrew and cast aside as I matured; behavior so remarkably like my own at their current ages as to be statistically impossible to come by unless inherited directly.

My wife and I raise registered horses. In addition to bloodlines, coloration and physical structure, we breed specifically for demeanor and disposition, as it is called in the business. Everybody does.

Demeanor is a major component of a horse's makeup and clearly is passed from one generation to the next. Not always, of course, but consistent with the basic rules of genetics.

You recall all that business with the peas in high school science class, right? Given the tenor of the times, I doubt they teach genetics in high school anymore. I have red hair. My wife has blonde/brown. Her hair color is dominant and mine is recessive. Statistically, one out of four of our children should have red hair. We didn't have that many children, unfortunately, so I am unable to prove genetics with my family members' hair color. I can prove it in spades with our horses, though. And demeanor is every bit as predictable as coloration and physical build.

The same is true for dogs, according to breeders with whom I have spoken. In fact, the same seems to be true for all creatures. In the lower animals, we call it instinct, a concept for which, you may recall from that same science class, we have no definition. And instinct is not limited to the lower animals, either.

Baby horses are on their feet and able to run within hours of their birth. In the distant past, those who weren't able to do so were eaten by coyotes and mountain lions, of course, so their flavor of DNA was lost, to put it in evolutionist terms, leaving only those who could. I have watched countless numbers of newborn horses and not a single mother had to show them how to stand, walk or run. They knew automatically...instinctively.

Officially, we don't know what instinct is. Not a clue. Tons of government money is spent every year, studying migrating whales and birds.

Here's a flash for all you scientists, and it won't cost the government a half billion dollars in study grants, either: instinct is genetically-encoded behavior. As Gallagher says of the Sledge-O-Matic: "*YES! It can be just that easy!*"

I figured it out, and I was a business major. You wouldn't think it would be all that difficult for the government wizards whose job it is merely to sit around all day and think deep thoughts. But it is. Yet another triumph of intellect over common sense. Your tax dollars at work.

I mentioned at the outset of this series that I envision genetics as culture gone to seed. In other words, behavior of one's forebears that sank into their DNA, the same DNA now walking around in an all-new skin suit. Do something often enough and it becomes second nature. Or, saying the same thing from an evolutionary point of view: certain behavior gets rewarded with life and others with death, such that the proclivity for some behavior gets passed along. Eventually, it looks just like behavior sinking into one's DNA, though the DNA produced it in the first place, then got naturally selected for perpetuation. Same thing from two different viewpoints. Of course, for evolutionists the question remains: Where did the DNA get the encoded behavior in the first place? Maybe that's where the creation part comes in.

Obviously, I do not see any inconsistency between Creationism and the Theory of Evolution. Why couldn't evolution have been a part of God's plan, once He created the Universe? And, there is a reason that evolution still is referred to as a theory, after all. There are very powerful arguments that can be made, refuting the possibility of our having evolved from some overly-bright paramecium. But, just because evolution didn't/doesn't occur as taught in public schools doesn't mean there isn't some validity to the concept.

Birds fly south in the winter because of DNA. Fish swim upstream because of it. Ants organize themselves into a strict hierarchical structure, just as do so many insects, because of DNA. Instinct. An easy way of ignoring the real answer: Behavior that is encoded genetically and written on DNA.

Why do you suppose human beings would be any different? This would be a good time to reread that quote from Jeremiah placed at the start of this piece.

The obvious answer is that we aren't different. Not a bit. We inherit our physical components from our forebears. As discussed in the last segment, we inherit our intellect just as readily. What now is being conceded by researchers around the world is what parents and animal breeders knew all along: behavior also is inherited. What surprises is just how much of our behavior is inherited.

We are all familiar with the twins studies, where the behavior of twins separated at birth is compared with that of those who lived together, as well as that of ordinary siblings. There is an astoundingly high, statistically-significant correlation of behavior within each pair of twins, whether separated or not and regardless of how disparate were the environments into which separated twins were thrust. Clearly, when their egg split in two, more than just the DNA controlling physical appearance was duplicated. Clearly, DNA controls a lot of behavior.

"Breeding shows," as they say, when speaking of character in people. And there is more than a grain of truth to all those redneck jokes. And fill-in-your-favorite-ethnic-slur jokes, as well. In fact, it is only *because* of that element of truth that any of these jokes are funny in the first place.

I used to joke with people that I became a lawyer so that I would have an excuse for being the way that I was. Turns out, the joke was on me. It was true. Once it happened, never again did I ever hear words to the effect of: "Why on earth are you *being* this way?" I was born to be a lawyer, sad to say. Today, I refer to myself as a recovering lawyer, yet another joke that really isn't.

Yes, character is partially developed or learned, just as some behavior is also developed extrinsic to one's DNA encoding. Character is simply a bundling of related behavioral response patterns. Ethics, a fancy term that the moralists among us like to employ, is merely the verbal description of certain behavioral patterns. We don't need fancy legal proofs or scientific studies for concepts such as these - they resonate internally with their authenticity. Admit it. They do. Don't make me invoke Gallagher again.

And it isn't necessary for behavior to be inherited directly; we need receive merely the encoded proclivity for a behavioral response. The behavioral response could be triggered by an external life event, much as epilepsy often is precipitated by a blow to the head. In a very real sense, we all are Manchurian Candidates, walking around, ready to manifest behavior in response to a particular stimulus that may never come. Behavior passed down from our forebears.

Proclivities without the actual condition manifesting are proven inheritable in the field of disease: some blacks pass along sickle-cell anemia without falling prey, themselves, and some jews are merely carriers of Tay-Sachs disease, for example.

The adrenaline rush that accompanies purely social anxiety is a good example of the inherited "fight or flight" predisposition, responsible for so many juvenile dustups. You might say that this merely is a matter of our bodies reacting to chemicals being generated, but that ignores the purely perceptual/behavioral nature of the stimulus that causes those chemicals to be released into our bloodstreams in the first place. Sexual response is another obvious area of inherited stimulus/response patterns in action. How many other response patterns lie dormant in our DNA, just awaiting a stimulus that may or may not come?

Since we can't do much about mere proclivities that lie hidden, the sole remaining interesting question is how much behavior is learned and how much is inherited and whether the inherited component can be trumped by education and/or environment. In other words, this field of endeavor really is about where to draw the line, not whether it is a valid field of study. More self-evident truth.

A joke about pigs comes to mind: Never try to teach a pig to dance - it wastes your time and annoys the pig. There are some behaviors that cannot be taught and there are some behaviors that will not be overcome by any amount of training or environment. The failing social experiment that America has become is proof positive. More on this later.

Without turning this into an X-File paper, I would like to note, also, that certain paranormal phenomena, such as experiences of past lives (reincarnation) could well be mere conjuring based upon the genetic encoding of behavioral patterns. Did the child who played the piano like a virtuoso without a single lesson really manifest the spirit of another or did he manifest the specific behavior of a forebear, indelibly encoded in his genes and retrieved intact? How much behavior is encoded that might be tapped into, if we just knew how? Is it possible that we might literally stand on the shoulders of our ancestors?

Studies have shown that worms fed other worms that have learned certain behaviors will manifest, with no training whatsoever, a statistically-significantly high degree of the behavior learned by the worm that was eaten. Maybe there was something to that business about the Aztecs eating the hearts of their enemies, after all.

This is a genuinely exciting scientific field of endeavor that has, until now, been foreclosed by the narrow-minded, control-freak political commissars of our time: the legions of the politically correct for whom it is necessary that reality conform to their desires that we all be seen as just the same. For whom "diversity" is Newspeak for conformity. Astronomy once was held in check by their ancestors, whose stupidity seems to have been genetically encoded and now is being re-manifested in the social arena.

Bottom line: Behavior is inherited, just like intellect and all physical characteristics. Indeed, a high degree of our behavior seems to be genetically predetermined. And there are very serious racial differences, the implications of which we will examine shortly.

You didn't know that 50% of human DNA is identical with that of bananas, did you? Or that bananas actually have 10% more DNA in common with humans than do worms? I wouldn't be surprised to learn, next, that rocks have DNA - everything else certainly possesses it. Chimpanzees possess 98.4% of our DNA, by the way. Reportedly, there is only .2% variation in DNA within the entire human race, with most (85%) of that .2% variance determining individual differences rather than racial differences. So, according to the scientists, only .03% of DNA differences are racial. Considering that bananas possess half our DNA, however, that small a difference in accounting for races isn't surprising.

There is a good reason why the same DNA is shared by all living organisms, including plants. Biochemistry is pretty much the same, whether in a plant or an animal - the same cellular processes need to occur for life to continue. Oxygen has to be transported and used. Nutrients have to be taken up and consumed. Waste products need to be excreted. All this requires genetically-encoded processes, whether in a chimpanzee, a human or a carrot. It makes sense that the DNA which controls essential functions will be much the same for all life forms. On the other hand, just because we have a lot of DNA in common with a banana doesn't mean I want my daughter to marry one.

Arguing over how minimal interracial DNA differences might be misses the point altogether, however. It is agreed that there *are* racial DNA differences. Whatever difference might exist is exactly what creates the racial differences that *do* exist - physical, intellectual and behavioral. It doesn't take much to make a big difference. After all, there isn't much DNA difference between siblings, yet the physical, intellectual and behavioral differences are, more often than not, remarkably divergent.

Consider the pro golf tour: it takes very little difference in ability among the participants for one golfer to end up completely out of the money and another to win it all. The same is true in virtually all human endeavor, whether competitive sports or business or romance or sandbox politics. Again, a fundamental truth that self verifies in that it rings true internally. Gallagher gets it.

The modern researcher gets funded only if his results match up with the politically-correct outlook maintained by the establishment. Recall how unusual it was for a round-worlder like Christopher Columbus to get funded at the time? Queen Isabella apparently was somewhat taken with him, since it was only her jewels being hocked that financed his little expedition in 1492. Thus, there is a great deal of noise about the DNA differences between individuals being greater than that between races, leading to a rather strained conclusion that, therefore, racial differences are *de minimis* or, even, that races don't really exist.

After all, there are any number of researchers claiming there are no interracial IQ differences, when the plain facts and almost everybody's personal experience prove otherwise. The entire scientific establishment's credibility is called into question by this single issue, yet there are so many other politically-correct conclusions being pushed by so-called scientists, much as the flat-earth "reality" once was pushed. We simply cannot trust them, folks.

I don't mean to sound like a Luddite with my indictment of modern science, however. As with all evidence in a courtroom, we merely should keep motivations in mind and accord weight appropriate to the evidence.

I am no researcher and have no way of validating whether interracial DNA differences are less than those between individuals. Even if true, however, it does not negate the validity of taking stock of interracial differences and acting accordingly. After all, the differences are...different.

For example, there is a pretty extreme variation in hair color within Caucasians. No such variation occurs in Asians and Africans, however. And plenty of Caucasians have black hair, too. So, there is more inter-individual difference in hair color genes than interracial. Does that mean that hair color differentiation is more significant than racial differentiation in predicting behavior? Obviously not.

What I wish to focus upon in this series in drawing racial distinctions, ultimately, is behavior. And that is where the critical DNA differences lie. As I said before, to discriminate on skin color makes no rational sense. To discriminate based upon behavior, however, makes a great deal of sense. After all, in society we discriminate against criminals in the name of public safety, retribution and rehabilitation by keeping them locked away.

Behavior is a composite of genetics, including intellect, and current culture, which I define as including the entirety of one's environment. Even those who deny genetic racial differences point to culture as being the source of all racial differences. With that, I am in partial agreement. Genetics provides part of the answer, but culture gives us the rest, which is why we take it up next.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/racism3.htm>

In Defense of Racism

Part 4 - Cultural Imperatives

by Edgar J. Steele

August 2, 2003

Part 1 - [Overview](#) (released June 30, 2003)

Part 2 - [Intellectual Myths](#) (released July 12, 2003)

Part 3 - [Genetic Realities](#) (released July 19, 2003)

Part 4 - [Cultural Imperatives](#) (released August 2, 2003)

Part 5 - National Disasters (to be released)

Part 6 - The Price of Empire (to be released)

Part 7 - The Future (to be released)

"You can take the boy out of the country, but you can't take the country out of the boy."

-- Proverb

Thus far in this series, we have covered some basic concepts essential to development of the idea that racism, in one form or another, might actually be a good thing.

We have dispelled *the myth that there are no intellectual differences between the races*, leading us to the inescapable conclusion that *intellect, as well as the more obvious physical characteristics, is passed from one generation to the next via DNA*. We have discussed *the importance of character over intellect and how character is a composite of a number of behavioral response patterns, only some of which are learned*. We have discussed *how behavior becomes genetically encoded in DNA, either directly or through natural selection, and also is passed on*. These concepts are neither trivial nor widely understood.

So, we inherit our appearance, our intellect and a good deal of our behavior from our ancestors, with there being substantial racial differences in all three areas. Accepting this is an impossible step for many to take, yet it is essential if we are to understand how the world really works and what inevitably results from multiculturalism.

The pace in this series seems plodding to those who have broken with convention and done serious thinking in the area of racial differences. For the vast majority, though, these basic concepts are earthshaking in their implications, thus requiring thorough development. Clear enunciation of the bases for these concepts assists members of the choir, as well, who might appreciate help in verbalizing to others the rationale for their politically-incorrect attitudes and beliefs.

Having surmounted the insignificance of differences in skin color and other physical characteristics among the races, we now focus on behavior as the prime basis upon which to discuss racism; behavior that, we see, is a product of both heredity and culture. The inherited component of behavior is double natured: DNA-encoded behavioral response patterns, called instinct in the lower forms of life, and intellect, which assists in producing behavior based upon one's culture and environment.

Clearly, it is possible to go against one's hard wiring, one's encoded behavioral response patterns, as a result of current experience (when I stare at another woman's breasts, my wife gets angry) and intellect (if I kill this asshole, I will go to prison). The interesting question is, "How much inherited behavior can be unlearned?" Another interesting question concerns the relative proportion of inherited versus learned behavior.

"Nature versus nurture" is how researchers characterize the tension between inherited and learned behavior. Perhaps in resignation, though they cloak their results in a great deal of statistics, these same researchers tend to ascribe a 50/50 role between the two for the human of average intellect. If you agree with my assertion that inherited behavior is "culture gone to seed," then it is easy to appreciate why it is difficult to separate out the two influences, because they appear to be the same thing from the standpoint of the student of human behavior.

Interestingly, these same researchers also postulate that the nature/nurture ratio varies inversely with the degree of IQ possessed by individuals. In fact, they extend the analysis to other life forms, as well. Here's their bottom line: the lower the intellect, the greater the degree of nature (manifestation of inherited

behavioral response patterns). Thus, the lower life forms, such as ants, are totally at the mercy of their DNA, operating entirely from what we mistakenly call instinct. Consider the poor dragonfly, who lives but a single day. Hard to accumulate much learned behavior in one day, yet they get their job of reproducing done.

Similarly, low-IQ humans are ruled by their inherited behavioral responses to a degree far greater than those of us with greater reasoning and analytical capacity. That just restates the obvious, though, because one clearly requires the mental capacity to foresee that one course of action leads to better results than a course dictated by simple human chemistry (the way DNA gets us to do its bidding, as with adrenaline).

There is, of course, no direct correlate with IQ, *per se*, just a general tendency, because of the way we measure intellect. IQ is merely an overall estimate of one's intelligence, based upon an assessment of several different intellectual abilities. People with the same IQ can have disparate spreads in abilities. The IQ number alone seems to say that verbal comprehension, for example, is equitable with spatial reasoning and any of another ten or so different characteristics. Fact is, different capabilities serve us in different spheres of life and we all have different mixtures of capabilities.

Not surprisingly, there are racial differences in the spread of abilities, like verbal comprehension and spatial reasoning, that make up what we call IQ, differences that are quite profound.

These racial differences explain the Asian gravitation toward math and the sciences. Asians are not superior intellectually because their average IQ is about 10 points higher than the average white. The standard deviation (a measure of how spread out data is) for asian IQs is exceedingly tight when compared to that of whites. In other words, there is a pretty small variation from the average for most asians. This explains why they can have higher average IQs with a much lower incidence of genius (and fewer morons, for that matter). This also explains why asians excel at copying and assembly line work, whereas Caucasians, with a much wider standard deviation (and a correspondingly higher incidence of true geniuses) provide most of the world's innovation.

These racial differences also explain why jews are disproportionately represented in arenas that reward verbal skills, which some say hold excessive sway in the calculation of overall IQ: sales, law, media, journalism and the like. The IQ differential goes a long way toward explaining jewish ownership of the world, but the jewish cultural ethic fills in the gap. Those willing to do anything to get ahead, all other things being equal, always will be the ones getting ahead. Think of being burdened with ethics as akin to barefisted fighting with one hand tied behind your back. Behavior, again. Character, if you like.

IQ and its various components are inherited. If you are an Evolutionist, then you explain this by pointing out that the environment rewards those with characteristics which favor survival with life. Creationists would argue that intellect comes packaged with the soul or, at minimum, is genetically encoded and passed along. Statistics favor the latter explanation, which in no way negates belief in a soul.

Again, there is no necessary inconsistency between the two ways of looking at the same phenomenon. Once created, it seems perfectly reasonable that some evolution would take place in any biological organism. The truly interesting question concerns the similarity between man and other animals and whether man is justified in exploiting them; a question beyond the scope of this series of articles and which truly involves theological issues that may be incapable of reasoned resolution.

IQ, therefore, is a product of one's environment and culture. We hypothesize that a harsher environment naturally selects the more intelligent, those who foresaw hard times in the way of bad winter weather and laid up stores in anticipation. Those who survived nurtured their young and protected them during their formative years. Those who didn't simply perished. Those who survived were naturally selected for further propagation and passed along their DNA-encoded intellect. This scenario supports the IQ breakdown of the races, as those with higher IQs originated in harsher climes.

Blacks, with lower overall IQs, originated in areas where physical prowess ensured one's survival, and intellect was only secondarily rewarded. Even after hundreds of years of interbreeding, the average American black's IQ still is 10-15 points shy of the average American Caucasian's.

In Africa proper, the average black IQ falls by another 15-20 points, more reflective of the black race's true genetic intellect being passed along. 30 points is a gulf. No wonder the wheel never occurred to any of them. No wonder that so many still live as they did a thousand years ago, barely eking out a living, eating off the land and eluding predators. They evolved in the African veldt, where strength and swiftness

were rewarded with life, while natural selection doomed lesser physical specimens. Broad, flared nostrils enhance the intake of oxygen, which is used in prodigious quantities by those oversize gluteal and thigh muscles in jumping and running, the very physical characteristics that allow blacks to dominate American sports today.

Behavior patterns also played a role in natural selection. The foolhardy died and the prudent often survived. The brave prevailed and the cowardly fell. There are countless response patterns encoded in each person's DNA, with similar DNA producing similar behavior. It is no surprise that there are racial differences. Here is where cultural stereotypes truly provide our beacon. The Irish predilection for strong drink. German technological superiority. Japanese industriousness and group cohesion. The black propensity for violence and primal physical satisfaction without regard for consequences.

Caucasians who didn't care for their mates and young may have survived, but their DNA didn't. Family is a part of white heredity. Without a protecting male, the pregnant female would not make it through the winter. In Africa, family is of far less importance because the constant climate and natural bounty provide ongoing sustenance. This difference has been genetically encoded and manifests itself throughout America, despite a similar environment and culture for the two races. But, I get ahead of myself with this line of thinking, properly reserved for the concluding installments in this series.

Similarly, current environment plays a role in developing one's behavioral responses. Witness the differences between street-smart ghetto children and their guileless cousins in the country, though born of the same racial stock. Even with superior weaponry, American soldiers repeatedly have been bested by guerilla fighters defending their own countries, stark examples of the advantage of complementarity of environment and man. Practiced often enough, through sufficient generations, behavior sinks into one's DNA and is passed along automatically, enabling one to adapt to one's historical culture and environment effortlessly. Think Sherpa.

Akin to the twins studies, there have been studies of families which have adopted children born of other races, both as babies and some already partially raised, both within America and without. Predictably, trouble comes with those from other cultures, though those from one's own culture produce difficulty for the family in excess of that generated by the parents' natural children. Interestingly, results suggest that racial differences are of more significance than culture. In other words, a white family can expect far greater difficulty after adopting a black child from within America than a European child of Caucasian heritage. Imagine that same family with a Bantu adolescent, fresh off the plane, who has never even seen a toilet.

Admittedly, racial behavior differences are due in part to racial intellectual differences, after all, as we have seen. But that is only part of the answer, as exemplified by test scores. Nor are intracultural racial differences attributable to economics except in the dreams of dedicated leftists. Extreme example: Whites in America from families with incomes below \$10,000 have average SAT test scores that are 46 points higher than American blacks whose family incomes range from \$80,000 to \$100,000.

Early beliefs and experiences are the most powerful, as they provide the lens through which all future experience is perceived. And perception is everything, as they say. Hayakawa's landmark work, "Language in Thought and Action," makes this point eloquently and convincingly. What Hayakawa missed, however, was the role played by genetically-encoded behavioral responses, which provide the very first lenses through which reality is filtered. Easy to miss, since it looks the same as acquired behavioral response patterns.

Bottom line: Behavior is almost entirely the product of genetics, culture and environment and there are profound racial differences. Very little intellectual influence can be expected to overwhelm established behavioral response patterns, both learned and inherited, even less as one's IQ declines. Character is the manifestation of certain behavioral response patterns and, thus, differs markedly between the races, and is of more importance in life than mere IQ. Some of these differences enhance day-to-life. Some, however, are dangerous.

Even descendants of races brought together from different cultures and environments will be living with the consequences of their different backgrounds, though they have shared a similar milieu from birth. That is the state in which white and black America finds itself today, on the brink of a national disaster the likes of which has occurred repeatedly down through history...as we shall talk about next.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/racism4.htm>

In Defense of Racism

Part 5 - National Disasters

by Edgar J. Steele

August 10, 2003

- Part 1 - [Overview](#) (released June 30, 2003)
- Part 2 - [Intellectual Myths](#) (released July 12, 2003)
- Part 3 - [Genetic Realities](#) (released July 19, 2003)
- Part 4 - [Cultural Imperatives](#) (released August 2, 2003)
- Part 5 - [National Disasters](#) (released August 10, 2003)
- Part 6 - The Masters of Disaster (to be released)
- Part 7 - The Price of Empire (to be released)
- Part 8 - The Future (to be released)

I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races. I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality.

— Abraham Lincoln, September 18, 1858

This series examines racism, which I see simply as preferring the company of those of one's own ethnic background over others. Most imply an element of false superiority when invoking the term, thus it has fallen from favor among even the politically incorrect. That is why many who unabashedly speak of racial differences as the basis for favoring one's own prefer the term "racialist."

Most of us prefer the company of members of our own family to that of others. Showing racial preference is the logical extension of showing family, or community preference. Be true to your school. Stand by your man. That sort of thing. Why must it be any different as the circle widens?

The politically correct see no difference between "racist" and "racialist," because they pretend there are no differences among the races except skin color and economic class. In fact, the politically correct dismiss anybody who dares even to speak of obvious racial differences, with nothing more, as being racist. Thus, the entire topic is off limits to discussion or investigation, with the consequence that serious scientific researchers either adjust their findings to the establishment viewpoint or become marginalized (defunded). The most glaring example is in the area of IQ measurement.

The sole exception to the racist "no-go zone" is invocation of the term "racist" to vilify another, either socially or judicially. Such baseless vilification has been done repeatedly down through history, as in Salem with the witch hunts or in the Middle Ages, via the Inquisition. The parallels are aptly made, since those guilty today of racism, via hate crimes or holocaust denial, for example, are routinely sent to prison throughout the Western world. A number of executions, in fact, have resulted due to the enhancement of criminal penalties engendered by laws governing racism. Thus, racism is seen for what it truly is: pure thought crime - thinking and expressing thoughts inconsistent with the establishment's point of view, though such thoughts were perfectly legal until very recently.

The politically correct believe that their approach is working, due to an apparent decrease in overt racism. They are wrong, as the politically incorrect are well aware. Racism merely has gone underground in polite society, and is building pressure, much as a steam boiler without a release valve - the release valve that has been plugged by societal pressure and hate crime laws. Witness the ever-growing resentment of affirmative action in both the left and the right in America. This pressure is aggravated by the sense of entitlement and victimhood engendered in so-called minority groups. A disaster of mythical proportions looms over the American landscape, awaiting only an ignition spark.

Simultaneously, there is a growing recognition in America that white separatists might not be the racists that the media would have us believe. Separatism is merely the act of being or living apart from others possessing specified characteristics. Want to live in a low-crime area? Near good schools? Then you are a separatist, because those are characteristics that do not exist in multiethnic neighborhoods. Separatism

might be racism, but if it is, then most whites are racist. Removing separatist tendencies and forcing full integration upon society is a very recent phenomenon in America, but not to the rest of the world, whose experience would be instructive, if only we were inclined to pay attention.

Race mixing has led to many national disasters down through history, the most noteworthy of which involve the fall of empires, a topic we will take up in the segment following the next. Lesser national disasters look a lot like today's South Africa and Zimbabwe (nee Rhodesia).

Both countries were founded by European expatriates and both were sparsely populated by indigenous populations at their founding. Both grew to substantial size and wealth, exporting agricultural products and natural resources, the most recognizable of which are gold and diamonds.

Blacks were imported from other parts of the continent to provide labor and prospered, as well, albeit at a pace far behind that of the resident white population. With a good deal of help from liberal elements in both America and Europe , blacks seized political power and thus began the downfall of two formerly great countries.

Today, white farmers are all but extinct in Zimbabwe and headed that way in South Africa . With the backing of anti-white governments, blacks have invaded farms and slaughtered farmers and their families. Crime has become rampant in both countries, with violent black-on-white crime, especially rape and murder, the most pervasive and most ignored. This is nothing short of genocide, with whites who do not flee the countries living in bunkers which are proving not to be the safe havens intended.

Moreover, both countries have become net consumer states, versus net providers a short time ago. The farms have been broken up and rendered nonproductive, with both livestock and seed corn consumed by the black squatters, with no concern for the future. The native population is...well, going native.

I have heard the African tragedies dismissed by liberals who sniff, "Well, this is the first time the African blacks have experienced real freedom, so a few missteps are to be expected." These people ignore reality.

For example, Liberia was founded shortly after Australia, with a constitution modeled on America's. Today, Australia ranks in the first tier of nations. Last week, Liberia once again collapsed into widespread anarchy. Or Ethiopia. Independent since 1855, save only four years when it was occupied by Italy (1936-1940), Ethiopia was host to the single greatest man-made famine ever known, in 1985.

What is taking place in Africa today was as predictable as night following day. One need only observe the behavior of blacks in the rest of Africa to foresee precisely how things have gone in South Africa and Zimbabwe .

After all is said and done, the best way to tell where you are going is to turn around and look at where you are coming from. Based on that analysis, things are going to get much worse in southern Africa , more akin to what is taking place elsewhere on the continent, where superstition is rampant and cannibalism still exists.

Those who have read previous segments in this series understand why. They know that we all inherit our appearance, our intellect and a good deal of our behavior from our ancestors, with there being substantial racial differences in all three areas. Those readers know that character is a collection of behavioral response patterns, most of which are directly inherited (breeding shows, as they say). Those readers also know that there is an inverse relationship between IQ and the degree to which our DNA governs our behavior, with the result that those of lesser intellects are bound to repeat the behavior of their forebears to a degree far greater than those of higher intellect.

The average African black's IQ is about 70, thereby placing a significant portion of the African population into the range of what we deem to be mental retardation. It is scarcely surprising that they, like the lower animals, are almost entirely governed by their inherited behavioral response patterns, passed to them from their ancestors via DNA.

Even the blacks now ruling South Africa and Zimbabwe agree that they preside over burgeoning national disasters, while simultaneously seeking aid of all forms from Europe and America . Whereas once they exported food in abundance, now their populations are again starving. All this on the continent that arguably is the richest in natural resources on the planet. The reason is obvious to those willing to see.

What is less clear is that America , too, stands on the edge of its own racial national disaster, and for the same reasons. The American disaster will take a different form, if for no other reason than the fact that

blacks comprise only about 13% of the total American population. Then, too, the average black IQ is considerably higher than that of their African cousins, though still 15 points less than the white average of 100...still a gulf.

A goodly portion of the behavioral response patterns encoded in DNA by Africa's jungle habitat still remains in America's blacks. We see it manifested in black street and gang criminal behavior on a daily basis.

As America slides into what now seems inevitable - a second economic Depression - the black underclass will take to the streets en masse because government will prove incapable of providing, as in the past.

America has operated under the illusion that white/black differences are socioeconomic only, thus interracial problems should respond to socioeconomic stratagems. That was a grave error, akin to the relatively recent medical practice of treating a variety of diseases with leaches and bloodletting. Out goes the bad air, in comes the good air. Sure. And patient America is doomed as surely as so many who died in times past from similarly arrogant medical blundering. Problem is, we are a part of this patient.

We erroneously believed that affirmative action, quotas, set asides, preferences and welfare would provide a temporary bandaid, a hand up for blacks to attain socioeconomic parity with whites. Then, such programs could be discarded and we could all live in multi-hued bliss. This literally was the rationale taught in law school in the seventies (and today, probably) for favoring one racial class over another.

I recall hearing my Constitutional Law professor muse that the new century would be one of true equality, allowing us to dispense with preferential treatment after a single generation. A recent US Supreme Court decision saw Justice O'Connor make the same argument, extending the time line by another 25 years, however, yet another generation.

Because of the inherent racial differences between whites and blacks, whites always will have to be handicapped in order to provide equal outcomes for the races. Get used to affirmative action, because it is here to stay. The good news is that "here to stay" won't be long, because America simply won't last that long. At least, not America as currently comprised.

Remember, with this series I am constructing a thesis that racism might be a good thing, at least some of the time. For that to be true requires good reasons. A rationale that withstands the charge of "Hate" for its own sake. I propose that rationale to be twofold: personal preference, on the one hand, and safety, on the other.

All will agree that we have the right to associate with our own family members, to the exclusion of others. So, too, is it our constitutional right to associate freely within our society. As a corollary, we should have a right not to associate with others, as well. Just as outsiders have no right to enter my family's home and associate with us in that setting, so should we have a right to live apart from others, solely because that is our desire. The US Supreme court disagrees. So much for personal preference and individual rights.

However, the US Supreme Court agrees that a certain class of people should be segregated from the rest of us for our physical protection and to facilitate rehabilitation of members of that class: the class of criminals. Therefore, separation of classes of people for certain purposes is okay if physical safety of the population is threatened. I submit that a simple extension of this court-approved logic demands that blacks be separated from whites.

American blacks comprise about 1/7th the total population. American blacks commit seven times the total violent crime that American whites commit. Do the math: blacks are fifty times as likely to commit violent crimes as are whites. Interracial crime, overwhelmingly black on white, has claimed more American lives in the past generation than the Korean war and nearly as many as did Viet Nam. There is a very real race war already raging in the streets of America.

As developed at length in this series, the black proclivity for violence, like all other behavioral response patterns, largely is mandated genetically. No amount of education, affirmative action, racial preference or welfare is going to change this disparity between white and black Americans. Only thousands, if not millions, of years of evolution will change things. Since the danger cannot be neutralized or eradicated, physical separation is required for the safety of white America.

Here is where many step up and say, "But, they're not all like that. You can't condemn them all because of the acts of some, even if the miscreants do make up a sizable portion of the entire population." Or,

better yet, "I judge people one by one, not in groups." There is truth to these viewpoints, but they ignore the reality of genetics and DNA-encoded behavioral response patterns.

It may well be that Alan Keyes (a recent black candidate for president who clearly was the best of an otherwise vapid field of whites) will never steal my hubcaps. However, even he will pass along his jungle-evolved DNA to children and grandchildren, some of whom will rape and kill my children and grandchildren in numbers consistent with their cousins across America. Yes, there must be full racial separation, else we are right back where we started in only a generation or two.

But, separation hardly will be a tragedy. After all, the races in America already show distinct preferences for their own kind in all situations: school, work and domestic. And, all but the white race are permitted to separate themselves in America. Whites can't do it because that would be racist, donchaknow. Fact is, other races want to invade our space only when it gives them some advantage which they cannot otherwise obtain for themselves.

The same rationale can be employed with regard to the hordes of Mexican illegals now occupying southwest America, given their demonstrated predilection for criminal behavior. And some Pacific Islanders such as Tongans and Samoans. Possibly Filipinos and Puerto Ricans, as well.

However, and this is where the rationale loses its ability to be called true racism, other races need not be segregated for reasons of physical safety. There is no demonstrated disproportionate proclivity for violence on the part of Asians, for example. Or Russians. Or Eskimos. Or any of a number of other racial groups.

In reality, the beef that real racists and racialists have is over the issue of safety. Without the black and Mexican elements of American society, most racists would be living blissfully unaware lives, just like other Americans do at present.

There is another racial group in America that is less obvious because of the lack of physical markers, but which presents an even greater menace to the safety and well being of white Americans on many levels, not just that of physical safety. Indeed, this group has made it possible, through black civil rights and unchecked illegal immigration, for both blacks and Mexicans to threaten the physical well being of white America, thus are to be held accountable for that harm, as well. We take up examination of that racial group and the rationale for its exclusion, as well, in the next segment.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/racism5.htm>

In Defense of Racism

Part 6 - The Masters of Disaster

by Edgar J. Steele

August 25, 2003

- Part 1 - [Overview](#) (released June 30, 2003)
Part 2 - [Intellectual Myths](#) (released July 12, 2003)
Part 3 - [Genetic Realities](#) (released July 19, 2003)
Part 4 - [Cultural Imperatives](#) (released August 2, 2003)
Part 5 - [National Disasters](#) (released August 10, 2003)
Part 6 - [The Masters of Disaster](#) (released August 25, 2003)
Part 7 - The Price of Empire (to be released)
Part 8 - The Future (to be released)

"The Jew and the Goy are like wolf and lamb; if you want the Wolf to dwell with the Lamb, please provide a fresh lamb every day."

--- "Wolf, Lamb and Ouroboros," Israel Shamir, a rare Israeli voice of reason

Thus far in this series, we have come a long way - much further than many might suppose, since the pace seemed so pedestrian. Methodical logic is like that. Each step seems almost trivial in light of one's current context. It is only when one stops and looks back to the beginning that the distance travelled becomes apparent.

Let's look back for a moment:

1. It clearly is a myth that there are no intellectual differences between the races.
2. Intellect, as well as the more obvious physical characteristics, is passed from one generation to the next via DNA.
3. Behavior "goes to seed" and becomes genetically encoded in DNA, either directly or through natural selection, and also is passed on from one generation to the next. In lower animals, this is called instinct. In humans, genetically-encoded behavior passes for intuition, sixth sense, spirit guides, reincarnation and a host of other misinterpretations.
4. Half of the average person's behavioral responses are generated from genetic encoding, such as the "fight or flight" response which manifests as social anxiety. The other half comes from learned responses, most of which derive directly from one's environment and culture. Very little behavioral response is the result of the exercise of one's intellect.
5. As one's IQ declines, one is ruled more extensively by one's genetically-encoded behavioral response patterns. Lower animals, such as ants, are ruled totally by instinct. It is easier to become Lawrence of Arabia than Ahab of America.
6. Character, a composite of a number of behavioral response patterns, only some of which are learned, is significantly more important than pure intelligence in determining behavioral responses.
7. Because character is so important a determinant of violence, merely possessing a low average IQ does not make one prone to violence, as shown by many relatively peaceful, low-average-IQ cultures, such as India's. Nor does a higher average IQ ensure that a culture will be peaceful - witness North Korea.
8. Separation of classes of people, such as convicts, is a necessary and acceptable practice for the safety of the general population.
9. Certain racial groups show a marked proclivity for physical violence. Generally, those racial groups possess lower IQs, therefore are responding to, and are at the mercy of, their genetic behavioral response patterns far more than others. No amount of learning, welfare, affirmative action or socialization will interfere with the behavioral response patterns of lower-IQ races. Nothing, other than generations of interbreeding with other races, will ameliorate their proclivity for violence. Blacks, who are given to physical violence at a rate 50 times that of whites, Mexicans and certain Pacific Islanders are among these groups.

10. Because all members of a race carry the DNA for that race's particular behavioral response patterns, even the proven peaceful members of a generally violent race will bear offspring with a high propensity for violence. Therefore, for the ongoing safety of other, less violent races, total racial separation is required. In times past, that racial separation occurred naturally, imposed by the realities of geography. Essentially, that is it. These ten points constitute the thesis of this series, which posits that racism might well be a desirable thing. Note that the end result is an unapologetic argument for racial separation, only, without making any sort of value judgment as to the value of one race versus another.

If you define racism as requiring something more than a simple preference for one's own and a desire for the safety and protection of one's own, then I am not a racist. Neither are you, I suspect.

However, the vast majority of Americans will call you racist for believing any or all of the foregoing. They are hypocrites, because they also are racist by their own reckoning, due to having opted for safe neighborhoods, good shopping and good schools, all code phrases for racial separation.

When America implodes economically, which even the most simple-minded Keynesians (but, I repeat myself) concede as being likely, the eruption of street violence will result in a massive geographical realignment along racial lines. Even the whites who continue to refuse to believe in the inherently violent nature of blacks will be forced back across the line by blacks who see their skin color as their uniform.

Blacks see whites as being advantaged as a race, which creates resentment among even those blacks who have earned their place in society. Those without much believe that all deserve the same. Those with much believe that only those who work deserve to get ahead. This unaddressed difference in racial outlooks increasingly polarizes American society. Thus, whites resent blacks, even those who earned their way through merit, for demanding and getting "something for nothing." This bilateral, brooding resentment has been growing in recent years on both sides, with no release allowed in an increasingly politically-correct society. When the building pressure finally is released, the result will be spectacular...and fatal for many.

Already, the carnage in the streets of America is outlandish. Annually, 1.2 million violent crimes occur nationwide, involving blacks and whites. In [90 percent of those cases](#), according to U.S. Justice Department figures, the perps are black and the victims white. Since blacks comprise only 12% of the total population of America, they are, therefore, at least 56 times more likely to commit violent crimes than whites. I say "at least" because Latinos are considered "white" when reported to be perpetrators of crimes.

In the three months following the end of the most recent Iraq war, 52 Americans were killed in Iraq. During that same three months, 66 Americans were killed in Washington, D.C., alone. And Washington, D.C. has outlawed the private ownership of guns (of course, that merely leads to a higher body count, but that is a topic for another day).

When the time comes, it will be more difficult to see and exclude a racial group more pernicious and harmful than those discussed so far: jews. More pernicious because the jewish grasp of power at all levels of American society is much broader, stronger and irresistible than the vast majority of Americans suspect. More harmful, not just because they have facilitated, through massive immigration and the hijacking of America's legal system, the physical harm which now requires the racial separation outlined above - but also because they have harmed us economically and socially, as well. Thanks to genetics, however, the harm will not prove fatal to the white race.

Truly the Masters of Disaster on a national scale, jews have been ejected from society after society, down through the ages - always for the same reasons and always claiming to be the victims of unjustified persecution. Today, however, they are engineering a disaster global in its reach - their "final solution," if you will: the New World Order. And America is their intended vehicle.

America's founders were well aware of the dangers presented by the jewish race. Following is an excerpt from the written records of Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, of the proceedings during the drafting of the Constitution in 1789 memorializing a statement made by Benjamin Franklin at the convention concerning Jewish immigration. (Original in the Franklin Institute, Philadelphia.)

"There is a great danger for the United States of America. That great danger is the Jew. Gentlemen, in whichever land the Jews have settled, they have depressed the moral level and lowered the degree of commercial honesty. They have created a State within a State, and when

they are opposed, they attempted to strangle the nation financially as in the case of Portugal and Spain.

"For more than 1700 years they have lamented their sorrowful fate, namely that they were driven out of the motherland; but, gentlemen, if the civilized world today should give them back Palestine as their property, they would immediately find pressing reasons for not returning there. Why? Because they are vampires and cannot live on other vampires. They cannot live among themselves. They must live among Christians and others who do not belong to their race

"If they are not excluded from the United States by the Constitution, within less than a hundred years they will stream into our country in such numbers that they will rule and destroy us, and change our form of government for which Americans have shed their blood and sacrificed life, property and personal freedom. If the Jews are not excluded, within 200 years our children will be working in the fields to feed the Jews, while they remain in the Counting House gleefully rubbing their hands.

"I warn you, gentlemen, if you do not exclude the Jew forever, your children`s children will curse you in your grave.

"Their ideas are not those of Americans. The leopard cannot change his spots. The Jews are a danger to this land, and if they are allowed to enter, they will imperil its institutions.

"They should be excluded by the Constitution."

The jewish IQ differential noted previously goes a long way toward explaining jewish ownership of the world, but the jewish cultural ethic (or lack thereof) is what really explains jewish world hegemony. Those willing to do anything to get ahead, all other things being equal, always will be the ones getting ahead.

Jews themselves will point to their culture as being the source of their drive. True enough. Problem is, that culture "went to seed" long ago, such that today's jews are governed by a genetically-encoded need to get atop others at any cost.

Even the seemingly amenable jew carries the DNA which will cause his progeny to want to control our offspring. And today's jews will pass along the wealth they inherited from their ancestors, which will ensure a continuing stranglehold, all other things being equal. Fortunately, all other things never remain equal. One thing the jews have done, time and again, and which has been their undoing, time and again, is to allow their grasp to exceed their reach. Today will be no exception.

Jewish zionists started both World Wars. Jewish bankers were behind the 1929 stock market crash and the Great Depression. Jews also are behind the economic meltdown just around the corner, which will cause us to start numbering our Depressions, just as WWII caused "The Great War" to be renamed WWI. Jews were predominant in the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and its many progeny, including today's Bilderberg Group, wherein the course of world events is set. Jews have a monopoly on American media and a stranglehold on foreign media. Jews literally own Hollywood. Jews control the international banking system through ownership of all central banks. Jews own most of Wall Street. (There is not enough space in this current series to take side trips into the who/what/why of these facts and events. Plenty of material exists on the internet, even if public library shelves have been denuded by jewish groups intent upon rewriting history. Do your own research if you doubt what I say and prepare to be amazed.)

Furthermore, jews monopolize the American pornography and drug industries. The "Russian Mafia" is really all those Russian jewish criminals, come looking for fresh meat. Jews are disproportionately homosexual and pedophilic (research NAMBLA and see for yourself); thus the push for American society to accept those "lifestyles" as normal. Feminism is a singularly jewish travesty, foisted upon an unsuspecting public.

Jews control America's government at most levels since the silent revolution of the Sixties, whereby the antiwar activists (virtually all jewish) assumed control and have become today's neoconservative warmongers (just count the noses around Bush, which are even more jewish than those surrounding Clinton). A change in outlook necessitated by furtherance of Israel's Middle East ambitions.

Jewish elements of America's government have been behind the massive change in immigration policies which choked off white European immigration and opened the floodgate to nonwhites of every stripe, even the illegals flooding across the border. Jewish hands are behind most of the civil rights organizations

which press for special privileges for ethnic groups (it was only recently that the NAACP, founded by jews, even had a black president, rather than a jew).

Lest you think that manipulation of other races is anything other than by jewish design, consider the following: *"We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tension. By propounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by the whites, we can mould them to the program of the Communist Party. In America we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the whites, we will endeavor to install in the whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. We will aid the Negroes to rise in prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment. With this prestige, the Negro will be able to intermarry with the whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause."* (Israel Cohen, A Racial Program For The 20th Century (1912) quoted by Congressman Abernathy, Congressional Record (1957), p. 8559.)

Now we have the spectacle of thousands of Somalians and Bantus, among the most backward and least intelligent that the human race has to offer, being transplanted to the heart of American cities. Some of these people have never even seen a toilet and all of them will be on full public assistance for their entire lives. Guess who heads up the organizations behind this boondoggle?

The American legal system has been hijacked by jews. An overpowering presence in any law school (50% of Harvard's *undergraduate* class is jewish), jewish lawyers flock to bar association seats, judgeships and public attorney positions, with the result that American law has literally become jewish law. Thus, the spectacle of things that jews don't like, especially things Christian or having to do with America's founders, being pushed down the memory hole. Hate crime laws are being jiggered toward locking up people who criticize jews, as now is done in Canada (think Ernst Zundel).

Virtually every case involving the removal of Christian symbols is brought by a jewish lawyer and/or plaintiff, often heard by a jewish judge. Rarely do I go into a courtroom where the judge or the prosecutor (often both) are not jewish. It was a jewish judge that led to the censure of Alabama Chief Justice Roy Moore this past week, concerning that Ten Commandments memorial. It was a jewish lawyer that prompted the 9th Federal Circuit Court to remove "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance. Jews even successfully sue to have multicolored Christmas lights removed from public venues.

America has held the record for having the highest percentage of its population behind bars for some time. Many complain of racial profiling in pointing out that over half the prison inmates are black. They are right. Racial profiling is at work, because the percentage should be much higher. Lately, however, the envelope is being pushed drastically, with many poor white, conservative, home-schooling Christians now being incarcerated for felonies that weren't even infractions a few years ago.

The so-called drug war sees a great many more poor whites put in jail every year for simple possession, while elements of the US government facilitate massive international drug trade, the most visible of which was the replanting of Afghanistan's opium poppy fields which the Taliban had lain fallow.

And there now is a roundup and imprisonment taking place of the more visible and vocal American white nationalist leaders, such as Matt Hale and David Duke.

It is no coincidence that the bulk of those being jailed these days are critical of things jewish.

Christ is being removed from Christmas and Christmas itself seems on the way out. Crosses are being removed from public property all over America because of jewish complaints. Amazingly, many formerly Christian churches now are removing crosses from their altars and podiums in rank obeisance to jewish demands.

Jews have uniformly shirked their duties in serving in the military, preferring to let others die in the place of their own children, though the wars producing the death tolls have always been jew inspired. American jews pulled off the Russian Revolution, which resulted in the death of over 20 million white Christians. Communism is a jewish invention, too.

Every time a dollar rounds a turn in the world economy, there is a jewish hand stretched out, ready to take a slice of it, often in the form of interest (usually at usurious levels) and often hidden, as in the "kosher fees" extracted, Je\$\$ie Jack\$son style, from industries for nonexistent "services" rendered (most consumer products today carry nondescript symbols indicating that a kosher fee has been built into the price).

Much of American industry is owned or controlled by jewish interests, often the same ones determining government policy, a la Enron. NAFTA and GATT, therefore, properly are laid at the doorstep of jews who sought to increase their profits, at the expense of the American working class, an increasing percentage of which is jobless today and likely to be jobless tomorrow, as well.

The American "mob" has always been jewish, not Italian. The Italians were merely errand boys and public fall guys for the likes of Dutch Schultz, Legs Diamond and Meyer Lansky, king of the jewish mob lords. Lansky's crowd was instrumental, together with rogue elements of the CIA, in engineering the assassination of John F. Kennedy and ushering in the modern era of jewish dominance of America at all levels (Michael Piper's book, "Final Judgment," is the absolute last word on the JFK assassination).

The "Holocaust" has achieved the status of a state religion in Western civilization, with its "denial" (which doesn't really mean outright denial, but covers merely stating true facts about the so-called holocaust that jews don't want circulated) being punished with prison sentences in most western countries. And it is milked for all it is worth, which is billions in "reparations" from countries and companies around the world.

Yet, Israel can do no wrong, while it is the recipient of billions in US foreign aid each year, some of which comes back to America in the form of bribes...er, campaign contributions, to keep our elected officials in check. Only in Israel is it illegal to racially intermarry. Only in Israel is racial segregation the order of the legitimate government. Only in Israel is it illegal for foreigners to vote...or hold property.

"Let's boycott Israel," some say upon learning the truth. Guess what? There is only one country in the world which boycotting will get you charged with a crime in America: Israel.

Only Israel could have gotten away with the murderous attack on the USS Liberty during the Sixties. Only in Israel is wholesale and widespread trafficking in slaves, mostly Russian women and children, allowed to flourish. Only Israel could get away with erecting the wall now separating it from Palestinians, built well into Palestinian territory.

Only Israel has an estimated 500 nuclear weapons, many nuclear missile submarines and massive biological/chemical weapon stocks, while officially denying it has any. Only Israel could threaten to take the rest of the world down with it in the event of a nuclear exchange with Arab states, yet have such a statement be ignored in the West.

I could go on for hours in this vein. The jewish yen for power, control and wealth at any cost is paramount among races, based on results. They have attained their desires, time and again, down through the ages, yet demanded more. It is cultural, of course. But, they have done it for so long that the culture has gone to seed and become genetic with them. Now, they cannot help but do it.

The full extent of jewish supremacy and control in America should be evident to the most casual of observers willing to see. What is not yet apparent is that they have, once again, overreached themselves and are creating the context for their own comeuppance. Witness the fact that they have gotten ordinary people like me now proselytizing like this...problem is, since America now has become such a jewish country, when they go down, we go down with them. And the landing will be hard, as we will see in the next installment of this series, wherein we consider the Price of Empire.

Benjamin Franklin was correct. Though generally I revere America's founding fathers, I do "curse (them) in (their) grave(s)" for not having prevented the disaster now looming before us while the solution was within their grasp. Now we will pay the price for that shortsightedness.

Maybe if we become obnoxious enough, the jews will erect a wall down the middle of America between themselves and the rest of us, as they have done in Jerusalem to the Palestinians. Unfortunately, that will happen only after they have taken everything we own, including a large measure of our dignity, just as they have done to the Palestinians. In any event, and one way or another, racial separation from jews in America is inevitable. It's just a matter of when.

New America. An idea whose time has come.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/racism6.htm>

In Defense of Racism

Part 7 - The Price of Empire

by Edgar J. Steele

September 13, 2003

- Part 1 - [Overview](#) (released June 30, 2003)
- Part 2 - [Intellectual Myths](#) (released July 12, 2003)
- Part 3 - [Genetic Realities](#) (released July 19, 2003)
- Part 4 - [Cultural Imperatives](#) (released August 2, 2003)
- Part 5 - [National Disasters](#) (released August 10, 2003)
- Part 6 - [The Masters of Disaster](#) (released August 25, 2003)
- Part 7 - [The Price of Empire](#) (released September 13, 2003)
- Part 8 - The Future (to be released)

"If the doors of perception were cleansed every thing would appear to man as it is: infinite."

---"The Marriage of Heaven and Hell," Plate 14, William Blake, 1791

"This is the end, beautiful friend

This is the end, my only friend, the end

Of our elaborate plans, the end

Of everything that stands, the end

No safety or surprise, the end

I'll never look into your eyes...again"

--- "The End," The Doors, 1967

"There is no fool like an old fool."

--- Proverb

It has become a trite symbol of middle age: economic and social success well in hand, the 45-year-old guy chucks it all, giving up his wife, his children, everything, for a fling. He buys a red Corvette and leaves town with his secretary. Only gradually does he begin to appreciate the immensity of his earlier good fortune. But it is too late. No fool like an old fool. "The end, my friend," as Jim Morrison might have said.

Countries are like that, too. Nations go through discernible periods. Though the length of time in each phase might vary, the progression is inevitable. And the end is never pretty.

I'm reminded of Gail Sheehy's "Passages," an excellent book, the research for which she is accused of having plagiarized extensively, by the way. "Passages" describes the seasons of a man's life as he grows older, noting how there are certain stages through which all men go. I started reading it in my late twenties, about thirty years ago. I found it eerily accurate - so much so that I put it down when I reached the point where I supposed I actually was in my life back then. I closed the book then and to this day it sits there on the shelf, daring me. "Come see how predictable you are," it seems to hiss, every time I notice it there.

Of course, it is perfectly reasonable that I *would* be predictable, given how greatly I am ruled by my genes. We all are, of course. Faithful followers of this series have seen developed my thesis that much of one's behavior is driven by genetic encoding.

I believe that societies go through similarly predictable stages. We can see ourselves reflected in the Roman Empire, to which modern America is compared endlessly. Carthage. India. Egypt. Their empires all progressed the same. They all ended the same. Badly. Why should we suppose that America will be any different?

It is far more than simply the insufferable arrogance of empire that leads to its downfall. And more than the economic laziness that develops as the result of having too much. The real key is in the racial makeup of empires.

Always, empire starts with a pure strain of overachievers. Always, empire ends with a strongly-diluted populace; diluted by havenots, ne'erdowells and intellectual inferiors.

Always, empire begins with strong leaders. Hard times breed hard men. Always, empire ends with weak sisters in charge. Empire attracts and fosters the weak and the spineless, creating a survival of the least fit, discouraging their masculine forebears. Look for a leadership structure where the same name repeats: Caesar, for example. Or Bush. Or, God forbid, Clinton. That is a mark of the end of empire.

Generally, I avoid references. However, another has gone so far beyond me in documenting the racial impact upon empire breakup that I won't attempt, even, to summarize his work. In "March of the Titans," A South African named Arthur Kemp painstakingly has outlined the rise and fall of empires from the dawn of time until modern times. A truly spectacular work that I wholeheartedly recommend. Go here for an on-line version: <http://www.stormfront.org/whitehistory/>

Human society is made up of humans. Humans are eminently predictable, therefore the interplay of humans, known as society, also is predictable, provided one can get one's mental fingers around the concept. Admittedly, it is a complicated model that one must construct in one's mind. But complexity *can* be modeled.

We model the stock market and, though we cannot establish exact timing (and timing in the stock market, more than most things, literally *is* everything), we know full well how things will go: the market goes up, then it goes down. Realize this and grow rich. Buy low, sell high. Easy, *n'est pas*? Based on results, no.

Most people get caught by the market, therefore most people are unable to comprehend that it moves both directions. How else could one possibly explain those who have been buying stocks for the past couple of years? Incredibly, some *still* are buying stocks. Witness the fact that the market still is near all-time highs, despite exhibiting clear signs of being in a long-term downtrend.

Most are unable to see trends until they have passed. Forests and trees, and all that. But we certainly can see other forests. Just as we can see other empires and thereby know what lies ahead for America. But most people won't. That's why middle America will not march on Washington next week and hang all the politicians from lampposts, as it should.

If only our "doors of perception" could be cleansed, Blake-like.

As an aside, Jim Morrison and friends took the name of their band from the Blake snippet quoted above, so impressed were they with the imagery therein contained. Similarly smitten was Aldous Huxley, the philosopher/author best known for "Brave New World," who titled his landmark work, "The Doors of Perception," a book which also served to inspire Morrison and company. Better than most, the Doors managed to fuse existential poetry and improvisation into their rock music and become the spiritual house band to a generation.

No longer do people debate whether America's is an empire; the fact is taken for granted. That perhaps is the surest indicator that we are well past the peak. When I heard cab drivers and hotel doormen in San Francisco discussing their stock portfolios a little over three years ago, I suspected the end of high-tech market mania was at hand.

We see the same things at work in America as seen during the decline of empires past. We bring back those we have conquered to till the fields and clean our houses. The borders are thrown open, due to both need and external pressure. We import our necessities and indulgences alike because the cost of transport is insufficient to allow our own inflated sense of worth to compete. We indulge in sloth because we can. Comfort becomes our master.

The very perquisites of empire are what inevitably bring it low. The curse of success. With massive immigration comes massive miscegenation. We send the best of our youth to distant lands, there to die while foolishly we maintain our hegemony. We lose our edge, our training, our skills, our will. We become bored and jaded, turning increasingly to frivolous and debauching pastimes.

Unfettered consumption leads to gluttony, an inability to produce and, inevitably, to poverty, which increases the pressure for more war, more conquest, more comforts, in a neverending downward spiral.

Buy low, sell high. We may not be sure of the timing, but we can be certain of the sequence of events. America's sequence clearly is in the downtrend. And empires never recover once they hit the skids.

No empire like an old empire.

Usually, it takes a long time for an empire to unravel. But, times are different. Things move with the speed of jets these days, as opposed to clipper ships and camel trains.

Also, today finds America firmly in the grip of a faction which is hastening the process consciously. America is ruled by globalists. It isn't that America's leaders are globalists, they merely do the bidding of their financial masters: the international banking families, the true globalists. Jews, mostly.

America is headed where it is because its masters think globally. That is always the problem with empire - the view of its masters becomes lengthened and their perspective thereby eradicated. What is good for empire, which is where the globalists dwell, is never good for the country originating the empire. Once under way, there is no way to stop an empire gracefully. Always, the source country suffers miserably in the end. America will be no different.

There is an ancient writer, Plutarch, if memory serves, who recounted a conversation involving Pyrrhus, a Greek king near the end of the Grecian empire, who discusses the point of conquest with a friend. "To be free to do what I wish," is a paraphrase of Pyrrhus' reason for marching off to conquer others. "But," the friend inquires, "you can do that now. Why go to war and risk all this?" Subsequently, Pyrrhus went off to war and conquered portions of the then-expanding Roman empire, albeit at a colossal cost in men and equipment, thus the origin of the term "Pyrrhic victory." Eventually, Pyrrhus was defeated, then killed, by legions of the growing Roman empire.

That is the price of empire. Better by far to be the vanquished. Just ask the Japanese.

Of course, one of the pieces of the old British Empire did ascend to a position of some importance. We called it the land of the free and the home of the brave. Might not a piece of this American empire do the same?

New America. An idea whose time has come.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/racism7.htm>

In Defense of Racism

Part 8 - The Future

by Edgar J. Steele

September 30, 2003

Part 1 - [Overview](#) (released June 30, 2003)

Part 2 - [Intellectual Myths](#) (released July 12, 2003)

Part 3 - [Genetic Realities](#) (released July 19, 2003)

Part 4 - [Cultural Imperatives](#) (released August 2, 2003)

Part 5 - [National Disasters](#) (released August 10, 2003)

Part 6 - [The Masters of Disaster](#) (released August 25, 2003)

Part 7 - [The Price of Empire](#) (released September 13, 2003)

Part 8 - [The Future](#) (released September 30, 2003)

"The sky is falling! The sky is falling!"

--- Chicken Little

"It is not the brains that matter most, but that which guides them: the character, the heart, generous qualities, progressive ideas."

--- Fyodor Dostoyevsky, 1821 - 1881, Russian novelist

Chicken Little was right. In fact, Chicken Little was a piker.

The primary advantage of getting older is the perspective one gains. Partly due to experience - gotten the old-fashioned way, with pain. Partly due to hormonal changes. Both tend to moderate one's outlook on things.

I got an early taste of it several years ago, when I was first treated for prostate cancer (now in remission for many years, thank you, and almost certainly a total cure). I don't remember the drug, just that it was terribly expensive, administered by shot into my abdomen and good for six months. It killed testosterone production (testosterone, you see, is the fuel that drives prostate cancer at first).

Part of a chemo treatment program, later to be joined to radiation, the drug totally changed my outlook. For the first time in my life, I could see any pretty girl and have no desire for her. Intellectually, I could appreciate her beauty and I could interact with her with none of my body language or subterranean communication, about which we know so little, communicating sexual tension. Women related to me differently - more comfortably. For the first time, I understood why so many women valued their homosexual male friends. I learned to distinguish the sexual from the other aspects in relationships which always end up so confusingly, and often so terminally, intertwined.

Like Billy Crystal says to Meg Ryan in "When Harry Met Sally," in explaining why men and women can never be just friends: "You pretty much want to jump them, too." Well, men *can* be friends with women; we just need a little perspective, which means a period without being at effect of our hormones. Otherwise, Harry is absolutely correct.

With advancing age comes a significant decline in testosterone production. Thus a modest version (lust light?) of the perspective I gained is imparted to all men in their late fifties and beyond. Even they, however, still are at effect - they still "pretty much want to jump them, too." Otherwise, there would be no old fools, of which there is always a bumper crop. Guys who deny this are lying, ladies. And not a single one of them has a clue about that which I have been describing, unless they have been freed somehow, either temporarily or permanently, from the grip of their hormones. They haven't the perspective from which to appreciate or understand. They hear the words, but they simply don't grok them.

By analogy, if you are a parent, try to explain the value of having children to someone who hasn't had them. The closest I have managed to come is, "For the first time, you learn that it is possible to love someone else more than you love yourself."

I honestly believe that the injection I received should be mandatory for all men at about age 25. One time only, of course. It would last only six months, yet it would yield a perspective on relationships that most men never attain.

I also recall working with equipment leases at my first accounting job which had been written in the early 50's using interest rates of 2% and 3%, about the same as they are today. They were the "old stuff" to be worked through because nobody would give them up in the face of the prime rate then going through the roof, hitting the mid-teens before it finally cooled off. I remember hearing my boss then, who should have known better, remark that, never again, would we see interest rates that low, because the business world had changed. I'm sure he is dead now, so he was right, in a sense. Of course, he is literally dead wrong, too.

Today, I hear younger people, who never saw the prime rate hit 17% thirty years ago, talking as though interest rates always will be low. Certainly, government is acting that way. I know better. Interest rates go up, and they go down. It takes a long time to see the entire cycle at work. You can bank on the fact that interest rates will increase again - probably quite soon. And, they likely will go through the roof again. This time, however, things are very different from what they were back in the 60's and 70's. In fact, things are far worse than they were prior to the 1930's.

Today, astronomical levels of debt are carried by government, business and individuals. Already, even in this low-interest-rate climate, we see record levels of bankruptcy, both personal and corporate. Even state and local governments are starting to go bust. That debt will crush the American economy when rates rise. Why, even a one- or two-percent increase in interest rates would send us into the serious economic depression that we have been merely deferring. *Imagine what adding 15 points to the rates will do!*

Rising interest rates will be the death of a great many Americans. Literally. When they rise, the sky will fall. The grand American experiment will shudder to a halt. Other nations know this. That is why they are doing all they can to prop up the dollar. When it goes, so does the whole house of cards, because America still is the engine of the world economy, albeit now as the consumer of last resort, not the producer, as in the past. That is why corporate insiders are selling stock at a record pace. That is why many foreigners are bidding up the price of gold. That is why so many, like myself, have fled the cities for the relative safety of the countryside.

It will happen. It will happen soon. The perspective I have gained from a lifetime of observing the economy, business and government absolutely guarantees it. Those who think otherwise and do not prepare are young fools. No fool like an old fool - hormonally. No fool like a young fool - economically.

When it happens, government will be unable to meet its obligations. The American underclass brought up to rely upon the welfare and social infrastructure built up since the last Depression will take to the streets. The racial warfare that exists already in the streets of American cities, the news of which actively is suppressed, will explode. Next time, Beverly Hills will be sacked, along with every tiny suburb of every city in America, because every city possesses the raw materials: a sullen and angry horde of blacks and mexicans, many of them illegals, all of them conditioned to feel entitled. All of them conditioned to believe that Whitey is the problem due to pervasive and pernicious racial discrimination.

When rates go up, the dollar will evaporate into hyperinflation. Wheelbarrows full of Reich dollars will be required to buy bread. Overnight, millions of Americans will join the record numbers of those now living in poverty in America. Though home mortgages will seem cheap in the face of inflation, we will not have even the small purchasing power then required to retire them. The banks will take our homes from us in droves, 1930's style.

Already angry with government at all levels due to its intrusion into our personal lives, most Americans will sit by and refuse to help. Some will see it as a time to exact retribution. That is when the "lone wolves" that the Southern Poverty Law Center and the ADL so fear will go into action. They know this. That is why they and their counterparts in government (can you say "Patriot Act?") are striving mightily to crack down on all of America, especially the political dissidents, record numbers of whom now grace the cells of federal prisons. That is why so many federal employees, even National Park workers, have been armed. That is why local police departments have been turned into military outposts.

Southwest America will become a no-go zone for all but the mestizos that already have renamed it Aztlan. A flood of have-nots from the cities will be met with hostility at the borders by well-armed country folk.

In the coming hard times, your skin color will be your uniform. Regardless of how touchy-feely politically correct you might wish to continue to be, blacks and mexicans will not be impressed. There will be a great many bleeding hearts literally bleeding in the streets.

Blacks will take over entire cities and concentrate in the South, where their greatest numbers already dwell, for their mutual protection.

The military response that government will feel compelled to employ merely will escalate things to full and open warfare throughout the country.

America will become a living hell for most. The sky will fall, in other words.

We have seen this scenario during our lifetimes played out overseas, albeit on a smaller scale. Foreigners possess little of the naiveté that is so rampant throughout America. They know what is coming. Bush has seen to it that they feel we deserve it, too, so they will not lift a finger to help when it happens.

It will be akin to the homily that recession occurs when your neighbor loses his job and depression results when you lose yours. When the sort of war that America has grown accustomed to inflicting upon small, defenseless countries finally comes home to America, then Americans will understand the pain, degradation and hopelessness that real war can inflict. Just ask the Iraqis, Afghanis or Palestinians what life is like for them. That is what can and will happen here. There *will* be American suicide bombers.

Interest rates. That's the key. A lifetime of perspective tells me they will rise - substantially.

It may start with a concerted program of terrorist attacks by outsiders. If so, that merely will serve to tip the first domino over. Eventually, the domino labeled "interest rates" will fall and, from there, things will spiral totally out of control. There needn't even be a trigger event, as the dominoes already are rolling over, as if in slow motion, and there is no setting them aright again.

You can bet the central and international bankers know all this. Indeed, they are accused by many of pushing the world into economic chaos in the 1930's. They went from being fabulously wealthy to being scandalously wealthy as the Great Depression (soon to be renamed The First Depression) segued into world war, giving them a fresh profit opportunity. Now they are outrageously wealthy and seemingly bent upon making this the last lap around the Monopoly board, since they already own almost everything. It's that "almost" that sticks in their craw. So long as there is the least little bit of truly free enterprise, private property and economic independence out here, their personal safety cannot be guaranteed.

Why? Because they can. Because it's there. Because they are terrified that we might figure out this shell game and come for them where they live. Well, they are right. Enough of us *have* figured it out. And we know where they live.

As we all seem to do, they have created the very reality they most fear. They forgot that pigs get fat, but hogs get slaughtered. This time, they have gone too far. Their lackeys, the Bushes, the Rumsfelds, the Ashcrofts, *et al.*, will offer little diversion when it comes time to root them out. Modern Nuremberg trials of visible leaders will not suffice this time.

There's another cycle, a view of which perspective born of age affords, something that I like to call the Cycle of Strife. Tyranny breeds freedom and freedom fosters tyranny, regardless of the type of economic or political systems employed. I happen to recall what America was like once, back in the early 50's. Younger citizens lack that perspective. But, things are quickening now, so that the relative freedom of the 80's will seem far distant, too. Trust me, there is a much bigger gulf between the 50's and the 80's than grew during the last 25 years. Nevertheless, Bush and company seem intent upon setting a new land speed record for American tyranny, so that even children have begun to notice the difference.

Patriots like to ask, "Is it time yet?"

Almost, my friend. Almost. I can all but smell the cordite in the air. Remember that the first American patriots shot *back*; they didn't shoot first.

Bide your time a while longer. When the time is right, our leaders will emerge from our ranks and we will begin to pick up the pieces. America worked once as a constitutional republic. It can work again.

Yes, Chicken Little was right. But, so was Dostoyevsky: *"It is not the brains that matter most, but that which guides them: the character, the heart, generous qualities, progressive ideas."*

We *can* do it. We *will* prevail. We did it once before. What more proof do you need, in order to know that it is in our genetic predisposition? Because of that, we can do nothing else. Breeding shows.

Character, above all else, counts. That is the true legacy of our forefathers, a legacy which cannot be legislated away by Congress, judicially usurped by the courts or summarily seized by the Executive Branch. All that other stuff that has us so incensed at the moment is just words, just stuff, just things.

We and our children and the strength that lies within us, stretching in an unbroken line from our distant European ancestors - that is what truly counts and what, in the end, will make the difference.

Be proud of who and what you are - it really is all you have. And it is more than enough.

New America. An idea whose time has come.

-ed

"I didn't say it would be easy. I just said it would be the truth."

- Morpheus

Copyright ©2003, Edgar J. Steele

Forward as you wish. Permission is granted to circulate among private individuals and groups, post on all Internet sites and publish *in full* in all not-for-profit publications.

Contact author for all other rights, which are reserved.

On-Line link to this article in HTML format: <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/racism8.htm>